



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

His youth and his failure to have seen his brother, Antilochus, furnish their own explanation, hence to mention him in the *Iliad* was not only unnecessary but impossible.

The wide limits of disintegrating criticism are shown by the fact that von Christ and Schmid found it "auffällig" that Peisistratus was not named in the *Iliad*, while Peppmüller, *Berl. Phil. Woch.* (1891) 231, condemned the same poem for naming Telemachus.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

MARGINALIA ON APULEIUS'S *METAMORPHOSES*¹

P..17. 9 (Helm) = i. 19: "sic denique eum vitalis color turbaverat. . . ." Helm wisely relegates to his apparatus his own emendation *mutatus* for *vitalis*, and all the other various changes (*tum* for *eum*, *calor* for *color*, *turpaverat* for *turbaverat*). As Oudendorp sanely observes: "immo sic mutando omnia dubia possimus quidem intellectu facilia reddere; sed et simul novos excudimus auctores." He rightly defends the MSS, quoting Plautus *Epid.* 560: "quid est quod voltus te turbat tuos,"² and Gellius XIX. i. 6: "coloris et voltus turbatione." Still, even if "vitalis color turbare ipsum dicitur cui turbatur pallore vultus" (Oudendorp), it is not easy to see why Apuleius did not express the idea as clearly as he does in 244. 7 (H.)=x. 10: "ingens exinde verberonem corripit trepidatio et in vicem humani coloris succedit *pallor infernus*" (quoted by Oudendorp). Perhaps wrongly we expect *letalis color*, which Markland proposed to read. I have wondered, though admitting the boldness of the suggestion, if *vitalis color* must not be added to three curious examples of *vitalis* that have not been mentioned in this connection: the funeral couch is called *vitalis lectus* in Petronius 42, grave-clothes are *vitalia* in Petronius 77, Seneca *Epist.* 99. 22, and in Lucretius iii. 820 the MSS give nothing but *vitalibus* in spite of the *letalibus* found in several modern editions since Lambinus. As a similar euphemism Friedländer quotes the use of *salutaria* in place of *funeraticia* (cf. his note on Petr. 42, and on euphemism in this connection Keller, *Gramm. Aufsätze* 154 ff., collects interesting evidence).

P. 34. 11 (H.)=ii. 11: "et perinde in eius faciem oculos meos ac si in Avernus lacum formidans deiceram." Readers of Herondas iii. 17 (the

¹ A slight correction of my note on Apul. *Metam.* ii. 29 in this volume, p. 90: the substance of the interpretation ascribed to Oudendorp appears in his note, but the form of statement is quoted from the Delphin edition. Had I known it at the time I should have added that Sopin suggested *scatebris* for *salubris*.

² It is very singular that while the editors of Apuleius have long used the passage of Plautus to support the text of Apuleius, to the present day the passage of Plautus is rudely emended (Goetz, Leo) or marked corrupt (Lindsay), apparently in ignorance of the Apuleian phrase.

incorrigible schoolboy's treatment of his slate: *κῆν μήκοτ' αὐτὴν οἶον Ἀΐδην βλέψας | γράψῃ μὲν οὐδὲν καλόν, ἐκ δ' ὅλην ξύσῃ*) may like to use this passage to support the interpretation "scowling at it as though it were Hades" as against the interpretation "looking as grim as the god of death."

P. 35. 4 (H.)=ii. 12: "qui dies copulas nuptiarum adfirmet, qui fundamenta moenium perpetuet, qui negotiatori commodus, qui viatori celebris, qui navigiis oportunus." Helm rightly rejects such changes of *celebris* as *salubris* and *celeris*, but inasmuch as the *Thesaurus* neglects to pigeonhole Apuleius's *celebris* I venture to reprint four passages that illustrate its development as a synonym of *commodus* and *oportunus*:

Plautus *Poen.* 255: "diem pulchrum et celebrem et venustatis plenum, dignum Venere pol, quo sunt Aphrodisia hodie"; *ibid.* 758: "die festo celebri nobilique Aphrodisiis."

Cicero *de amicitia* iii. 12: "ex multis diebus quos in vita celeberrimos laetissimosque viderit, illum diem clarissimum fuisse cum. . . ."

Panegyr. (ed. Baehrens) ii. 1: "celeberrimo isto et . . . laetissimo die. . . ."

P. 51. 11 (H.)=ii. 32: "inprovidae noctis caligine liberati . . ."; cf. 65. 20 (H.)=iii. 18: "inprovidae noctis deceptus caligine." In the former passage the torch is blown out by a gust of wind, and the passive force of *inprovidus* has consequently been favored; so Butler translates "sudden darkness," and Hildebrand tries to defend the passive usage. But I agree with certain unnamed predecessors of Priceus, whose note runs: "exponunt *obscure*, ego *improvisae*"; for the passive force he quotes Pliny *Epist.* iv. 22. 5 and Apuleius's *fortunae inprovidos casus* (*de Platone* i. 12=p. 96. 17 Thomas). The fact seems to me clear that *nox inprovida*=*nox caeca*. In the first place, in 65. 20=iii. 18 (cf. above) the context does not require or suggest a passive force. Secondly, *inp[er]e[r]idae voluptatis* (184. 9=viii. 9), *inprovido saltu* (169. 12=vii. 20), *inprovida malitia* (277. 12=x. 15), *inprovidi sermonis* (47. 6=ii. 27) all point to the active force of the adjective in the sense of "blind, reckless"; in fact there is no example in Apuleius in which the passive force is needed: for the *inprovidos casus* of Fortune in *de Platone* (cf. above) are as easily "blind" as "unforeseen." Thirdly, Apuleius does not need to use *inprovidus* with a passive meaning; for he has *inprovisus* six times. Finally, Latin usage clearly substantiates *inprovidus* as a synonym of *caecus*: "festinatio improvida est et caeca" (Livy xxii. 39. 22), "caeci atque improvidi" (Curt. viii. 13. 25), "amorem rerum suarum caecum et improvidum" (Seneca *Dial.* vii. 10. 2), "caecum veteres pro improviso dixerunt" (Non. 525. 14 M.), "caecus atque improvidus futurorum" (Aug. *Civ.* iii. 30); nor will it be possible in view of such passages to agree with Priceus that *tela . . . caeca et improvida* in Pliny, *Epist.* iv. 22. 5 is a case of the passive force, unless one wishes to take the poetry out

of Pliny's phrase: for in most of the passages quoted *caecus* and *inprovidus* endow inanimate things with human attributes.

P. 65. 3 (H.) = iii. 17: "priusque apparatu solito instruit feralem officinam, omne genus aromatis et ignorabiliter lamminis litteratis et infelicium [n]avium durantibus, damnis defletorum, sepultorum etiam cadaverum expositis multis admodum membris." This difficult passage suggests various comments.

Helm's critical apparatus is worthy of all praise because it so often interprets. Among his excellent contributions to interpretation are various notes on collocation. So, for example, the peculiar collocation of the adverb and the other word syntactically connected with it is admirably illustrated in various examples scattered through Helm's notes:

- ignorabiliter lamminis litteratis* (above)
- coram magiae noscendae* (66. 14 = iii. 19)
- temere fascem lignorum positum* (72. 16 = iii. 27)
- probe calicibus exfricatis* (79. 26 = iv. 7)
- oppido formido cumulatior* (45. 17 = ii. 25, after Leo)

To these I may add:

- aliquanto propheta commotior* (49. 4 = ii. 29)

But the reason for such dislocation of the adverbial modifier is more significant than the fact itself: it is hardly accidental that in every case the dislocation results either in the formation of an alliterative pair or of homoeoteleuta, or in the avoidance of hiatus.

These peculiarities of style an editor should consider, and in the present passage it seems to me that Helm (following Leo's interpretation) has disregarded the balancing, which his punctuation destroys. My understanding of the structure may be indicated roughly in this separation of the balanced elements:

omne genus aromatis
et ignorabiliter lamminis litteratis
et infelicium [n]avium durantibus damnis
<> defletorum, sepultorum etiam cadaverum expositis multis admodum
membris

There is variety within the symmetry, but the balance is marked: note *lamminis litteratis*, *dulantibus damnis*, *expositis . . . membris*, and the alliteration in the first two pairs in connection with *multis . . . membris* in the next phrase; note also the balanced genitive modifiers, *infelicium [n]avium* and *defletorum, sepultorum etiam cadaverum* with varying homoeoteleuta. The balancing of the sentence that follows our passage may serve to show that our author is here as conscious of his manner as of his matter.

In brief, I think that the style demands a comma after *damnis*, not before it. Whether or not an <et> must be supplied before the last member can hardly be determined until Apuleius's practice in the use of polysyndeton is carefully studied, but the supplement is easy if necessary. Nor is there any difficulty in the interpretation: Abt (*Die Apologie und die antike Zauberei*, p. 222, n. 3=p. 148, n. 3) has interpreted *Apol.* 35=p. 41. 1 (H.) in a way that will make future editors hesitate to change *narium* to *avium*¹ (but for the latter cf. *Apol.* 58=p. 66. 5 and p. 66. 14 H.): he refers *resticulas* in *Apol.* 35 to shipwrecked vessels, quoting *Pap. Lond.* 121. 657 W.: ποίησον ἐλλαγχυ[α]ζάπ]ὸ τλαίον νεναιαγηκότος. And the *Thesaurus* (V, 28, 18) brings into connection with *damnis* in our passage Lucan ix. 440 with a scholium thereon. The distinction in the last phrase between *defletorum* and *sepultorum* is made clear by Leo's reference to 43. 8 (H.)=ii. 21, 50. 5 (H.)=ii. 30, 41. 12 (H.)=ii. 20.

P. 89. 17 (H.)=iv. 20: "scaenam denique, quem sponte sumpserat, cum anima retinens nunc fugiens nunc resistens . . . domo prolapsus est." A robber, disguised as a bear, is endeavoring to escape his pursuers, who do not yet know that he is a human being and are the more cautious because they imagine him to be a bear. What does *cum anima* mean? *Scaena* clearly means his "rôle" (cf. Oudendorp and Hildebrand). Helm interprets *cum anima* as *dum spirat*, referring to *illo spiritu expugnato* in the description of the robber's death on the next page (90. 14); from this interpretation I can extract only the meaning "he preserves his rôle as long as he lives," and Butler translates accordingly. H. Bluemner (*Mélanges Nicole*, p. 30) remarks: "man wird nicht umhin können *cum animo* zu lesen, da auch bei Apuleius *anima* meines Wissens niemals in der Bedeutung 'Mut,' die hier erforderlich ist, vorkommt." This simply begs the question at issue. We may agree that *cum anima* cannot mean "spiritedly," but we do not admit that "spiritedly" is the meaning required.

The force that makes the phrase really effective is secured simply by taking *scaenam* . . . *cum anima* in the sense of *scaenam et animam*, just as in 92. 19 (H.)=iv. 23 *crines cum veste*=*crines et vestem*. The robber keeps his rôle of bear along with his life; that is, he keeps his rôle, and in so doing, saves his life for the time being.

P. 90. 22 (H.)=iv. 21: "nisi . . . quidam lanius . . . utero bestiae resecto [ursae] magnificum despoliavit latronem." The robber is caught at last; a butcher rips him open, and discovers that he is only skin-deep a bear. Helm follows Roaldo in ejecting *ursae* as a gloss on *bestiae*; such a gloss presupposes a singular degree of ignorance on the part of the readers for whom the gloss was intended. Floridus tries to make *ursae* . . . *latronem* mean "bear-robber," which Oudendorp rightly rejects as absurd.

¹ Cf. Petschenig *Wien. Stud.* IV, 145.

Priceaus emends to the ablative *ursa*, Hildebrand keeps *ursae* as a Greek genitive of separation (cf. 99. 8 [H.] = iv. 31: "quem et dignitatis et patrimonii simul et incolumentatis¹ ipsum Fortuna damnavit," though hardly a perfect parallel), Petschenig (*Wien. Stud.* IV, 147) regards *ursae* as a dative of separation, comparing "laevae . . . dependebat" 269. 6 (H.) = xi. 4, "quieti revulsum" 52. 7 (H.) = iii. 1. To these three efforts, which seem to me in the right direction, Helm objects: "spolia adimuntur latroni, non latro spoliis." The only answer that any reader of Apuleius can make to Helm is that fortunately Apuleius or his Greek model had more sense of humor than some of his modern editors. When Lucius finally returns to his human form, does he say "as soon as I was rid of the ass' skin"? No, but on the contrary, "me cum primum nefasto tegmine despoliaverat asinus" (276. 26 [H.] = xi. 14). This passage should save *ursae*, whether it be genitive or dative, or the emendation *ursa* if it is necessary, from matter-of-fact treatment by a modern editor: the butcher robbed the robber—of the bear!

P. 113. 3 (H.) = v. 12: "dies ultima et casus extremus <immin> et: sexus infestus et sanguis inimicus iam sumpsit arma et castra commovit et aciem direxit et classicum personavit." Again the editor seems to me singularly insensitive to Apuleius's fondness for balance and symmetry. In this, however, he simply follows others: his textual apparatus reports various efforts to secure the same result. Must we supply a verb for the first two subjects, or in some way separate them from the next two subjects? Apparently the basis of such changes as Michaelis, Rohde, Kronenberg, Traube, and others make, is the feeling that there is something discordant in the combination of the more abstract *dies* and *casus* with the more concrete *sexus* and *sanguis*, as well as in the combination of the figurative military expressions with the subjects *dies* and *casus*; some scholars seem also to require an echo of *venit summa dies et ineluctabile tempus* (*Verg. Aen.* ii. 324). But he undertakes a heavy responsibility who removes from the text of Apuleius such perfect symmetry as the MSS offer:

dies ultima et casus extremus et sexus infestus et sanguis inimicus iam sumpsit arma et castra commovit et aciem direxit et classicum personavit.

Perfect symmetry, except that we have *sumpsit arma* instead of *arma sumpsit*, perhaps to avoid the cacophonous *iam arma*.²

¹ These genitives are strangely called causal in the *Thesaurus* V, 17, 43.

² I should have withheld this note after reading Petschenig, *Ztschrft. f. oesterr. Gym.* XLII, 748: ". . . nach der Ueberlieferung entsprechen vier Subjecte, vier Prädicatsverben, von denen wieder jedes ein Object bei sich hat," but since Helm makes no reference to Petschenig, it seems worth while to emphasize the reasonableness of Petschenig's comment.

P. 181. 18 (H.)=viii. 7: "sed Thrasyllus . . . illum amicum, coaetaneum, contubernalem, fratrem denique addito nomine <voce> lugubri ciere. . . ." Thrasyllus, in love with the wife of Tlepolemus, has foully murdered the husband, and now hypocritically mourns his victim's death, according to the MSS *addito nomine lugubri*. Priceaeus thereon exclaims: "quid hic nomen lugubre? aut quid ratio epitheti illius?" He reads *lugubriter* with a comma after *nomine*. Oudendorp assents to the objection of Priceaeus, and suggests inserting *voce* (which Helm adopts) or *sono*. By what flight of fancy Hildebrand reaches the conclusion that the *nomen lugubre* is that of Thrasyllus I must leave to some more ingenious reader to discover.

But I fail to see what is wrong with the reading of the MSS. Thrasyllus exclaims over the corpse: "amice, . . . , frater Tlepoleme." Considering the circumstances of Tlepolemus' death—Tlepolemus bravely faced a wild boar, hurled his spear at him, Thrasyllus thrust his spear at the horse of Tlepolemus, the horse threw Tlepolemus to the ground, the boar attacked Tlepolemus, gored him, then Thrasyllus, not content, thrust his lance into Tlepolemus—what under these circumstances could be more truly a *nomen lugubre* than the victim's name, "Tlepolemus," "sturdy fighter," in the mouth of the murderer? The sensitiveness of Apuleius or of his Greek model to the meaning of proper names needs no comment; cf. the next page 182. 14 (H.)=viii. 8, and Helm, *Praefatio to the Florida*, p. xxxii.

P. 209. 15 (H.)=ix. 9: "et identidem urgenti sermone comprimunt, promerent potius aureum cantharum. . . ." The mendicant priests have stolen a golden goblet, and are urged to give up the stolen property. The adverb *potius* is left without any explicit second member in the comparison. Very likely Apuleius intended us to supply the missing member (cf. Hildebrand's note). Helm, in his apparatus, suggests inserting <*lamentantes*> before *comprimunt* to make the implication easier. But if any change is needed, which I doubt, an emendation of *potius* to *protinus* (written *ptinus?*) might be a simpler way out of the difficulty.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

NOTES ON LUCRETIUS

1. 321: "invida praeclusit speciem natura videndi"; cf. Hilary *Trac. in Psalm. lv. 5*: "naturam videndi caecis ab utero."
3. 42: "infamemque ferunt vitam quam Tartara leti"; cf. Apul. *De Deo Socr. 129*: "terrae tartara."
3. 198: "at contra lapidum coniectum."

The manuscripts have *coniectum*, which may be defended by Cie. *Att. iv.*

3. 2: "domus fracta coniectu lapidum ex area nostra."